



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

John 1:14 attention is called to the fact that *πλήρης* is used as indeclinable, not only in the New Testament, but also in the Septuagint and in papyrus documents from Egypt. In addition to the poetical quotations and the apparently accidental verses which are ordinarily cited, Professor Blass points out the two faultless iambic trimeters of Heb. 12:14 f.,

οὐ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν κύριον
ἐπισκοποῦντες μή τις ὑστερῶν ὑπὸ,

which follow the faultless dactylic hexameter of 12:13,

καὶ τροχιάς ὀρθὰς ποιήσατε τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν,

and several other iambic verses in the same epistle.

The illustrations which have been given above will make clear to scholars the character of this grammar. Discussions which filled pages of the old grammars of the New Testament Greek are made unnecessary by some one authoritative judgment. The treatment of conditional sentences seems less masterly than most of the rest of the work, and the application of the term *completion* (*Vollendung*) to the service of the aorist is liable to be misunderstood, but the book as a whole is admirably convenient and unusually stimulating. Philology has again rendered good service to theology.

T. D. SEYMOUR.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

JÉSUS DE NAZARETH. Études critiques sur les antécédents de l'histoire évangélique et la vie de Jésus. Par ALBERT RÉVILLE, Professeur au Collège de France. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1897. 2 vols. Pp. x+500+522. Fr. 15.

PROFESSOR RÉVILLE brings to his task the training of long study in the history of religions and a most frankly confessed enthusiasm for Jesus. The wide interest of the historian is seen in the care with which the antecedents of Christianity are traced from the beginnings of Israel's life, through the experiences of the monarchy, the exile, and the post-exilic times. The conception of Israel's religious history is that of the naturalist wing of the current Old Testament criticism, the genesis of the later monotheism being found in an earlier *monolatry*, the worship of Jehovah, the God the people came to know and fear above all other gods during their sojourn in the neighborhood of Sinai, and whose attributes they derived from the solitariness, severity, and thunder-guarded mystery of the summits which were the

deity's abode. Special care is given to the later developments of the people's life and thought, the synagogue, the growth of rabbinism, and the Messianic hope receiving particular attention.

Interesting as this long section (I, 1-253) is, it must be confessed that there is some excess of ingenuity, to say the least, in the account of the rise of monotheism. The problem of the Essenes, moreover, is too easily dismissed by making them merely the extreme wing of the Pharisaic party, not noticeably affected by any extra-Jewish influences. M. Réville thinks that the refusal of the sect to participate in the sacrifices of the temple was intended as a protest against the usurpation of the highpriesthood by the Maccabean princes. Why, then, did the protestants send offerings for the burning of incense in the temple?

The various chapters are furnished with convenient bibliographical lists. It causes some surprise, however, to find in the references on the Messianic hope no mention of Baldensperger's *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, and to note the author's seem-preference for earlier editions of the psalms of Solomon and the book of Enoch over the certainly superior works of Ryle and James, and R. H. Charles.

The justification for M. Réville's confession of great love to Jesus of Nazareth appears in a very sympathetic chapter on the "Youth of Jesus." The exaltedness, yet essential naturalness, of Jesus' own religious life is nobly set forth. In this period and its silent experiences Professor Réville truly finds the roots for the chief of the teachings of Jesus—the conception of God as Father, and of the kingdom of God as a spiritual affair. That Jesus also stored his mind and imagination at this time with those varied treasures which later he used to adorn his teachings is doubtless true. One is not so sure, however, that it is necessary to assume with M. Réville that such parables as the Pearl of Great Price, the Unjust Steward, the Lost Coin, recount actual events which came under Jesus' notice during these earlier days. Such a view lacks somewhat in appreciation of the fertility of imagination which could use such commonplace events to set forth spiritual truth. The chapters on the ministry of John the Baptist, and the baptism and temptation of Jesus, show much reverent insight, and throughout this part there is a high sense of the "charm" of Jesus, by which he so irresistibly attracted men and women to him in his active ministry. The Sermon on the Mount is for M. Réville the gospel *par excellence*. In it we have what Jesus taught, in the simplest, least adulterated, form that has come to us. Some of the

parables rank alongside this gospel, but it furnishes the norm by which all else that seeks recognition as from Jesus must be tested.

Although his enthusiasm for Jesus and his gospel seems to be very genuine, M. Réville is led into strange places by the prejudgment with which he comes to his task. The supernatural, as commonly conceived, is non-existent for him. He is far more thoroughgoing in the rejection of miracles than Keim or Weizsäcker or Pfleiderer. The miraculous incidents interwoven with the record of Jesus' public ministry he treats as having some kernel of fact underlying them which may or may not be discoverable at this distance from the events. Thus the feeding of the multitudes is a story which has grown out of the fact that Jesus at the height of his popularity in Galilee gathered a large number of his disciples together for a fraternal meal, the prelude to future *agapæ*; the walking on the sea has grown out of a vision of the disciples, in which their Master appeared with the glory their imaginations ascribed to him; the Syrophenician woman's daughter was suffering from an attack of neuropathy, which soon passed of its own accord, and not improbably returned at a later time. The narratives of the infancy find a unique explanation. M. Réville feels the thoroughly Jewish character of the stories, therefore does not seek to explain them by any appeal to Greek ideas of incarnation and the like. The key to the problem is in the rivalry between the disciples of John the Baptist and the disciples of the Nazarene. The former, seeking to exalt their teacher, invented extraordinary features in connection with his birth, like those which the Scriptures narrate in the cases of Isaac and Samuel. John was revered by the Christians, hence they would not enter into controversy which might seem derogatory to the great forerunner, only they would invent for their Master a birth story which should quite outrival anything that had been said about John! Professor Réville's imagination is no less fertile in explaining the resurrection stories. For him the ultimate kernel of fact is the empty tomb. Not that the disciples stole the body—that is inconceivable in view of their surprise and later sincerity of faith. But the authorities removed it to prevent the tomb from becoming a center of devoted pilgrimage. The empty tomb aroused the disciples' imagination and wonder. They remembered a word of Jesus appointing a *rendezvous* in Galilee. That was before he was crucified, and when he anticipated a retirement from the city where he had been unsuccessful in winning a following. They went to Galilee, and hallucinations springing from their excited imaginations did the

rest. The exigencies into which such an elimination of the supernatural brings our author appear best in his conception of the final tragedy. Jesus could not have anticipated his own death, therefore he went to Jerusalem, partly to escape the hostility of Antipas, and partly to extend his own influence. It was his first appearance there (for M. Réville's rejection of the fourth gospel see below), and instead of the interest which he had awakened in Galilee he found a marked indifference and coldness, even as many another has learned that a man of much provincial importance is received in the metropolis with careless disdain. This stung the young Galilean prophet into an act of presumption—the cleansing of the temple, by which he hoped to command a following, but which only served to fix the hostile attention of the leaders on him. His death was determined, but no move was to be made until after the feast had passed. Joseph of Arimathea, who was friendly to Jesus, told him of his danger, but also of his safety until after the feast. Jesus then planned his withdrawal to some desert place, to be alone until the storm passed, and until he had readjusted himself to the disappointment he had met in Jerusalem. He appointed a *rendezvous* in Galilee, where he would later rejoin his disciples, and then remained in Jerusalem to celebrate the passover, feeling safe until after the feast, purposing then to retire from Jerusalem. But the whole plan was upset by the treachery of Judas, which enabled the rulers to arrest Jesus at once, without danger of an uprising from the multitudes of Galileans present in Jerusalem, and he died a victim of their hostility, and also of his own double mistake in departing by an act of violence from his earlier uncomprising insistence on the purely spiritual character of the kingdom of God, and in then lingering about the scene of danger. The man of Galilee, rarely pure and beautiful in character, living in intimate communion with the Unseen, discovering the pure spirituality of religion, proclaiming it against all the forces of organized formalism, and winning little by little a group of followers ready to cleave to him and be taught in the ways of God—this is one to rouse enthusiasm and win devotion. But this same man departing from Galilee to try his fortunes in the capital of his people; this man, whose better self scorned anything spectacular, stung by the indifference of the capital to an act of violence, in which he was false to his best self—for such a one it is hard to keep our admiration. Yet such in baldest statement is M. Réville's conception of the life he professes to admire above all other lives. He thinks of Jesus' instant revulsion to the truth as earlier held and taught in the

Galilean period, of a hope that, by keeping in retirement for a little, the tempest his presumption had aroused might blow over and allow of a continuance of spiritual ministry. But the fact remains, the Jesus whom M. Réville loves is the Jesus of Galilee; Jerusalem seems to have taken away his Lord—to adopt Mary's complaint to the gardener.

Our author naïvely owns that "neither the evangelists nor the tradition which they have recorded would have been willing to acknowledge that Jesus was surprised by the course of events" leading to his death. In fact, it is not a story found in these sources, but one imposed by the interpreter on them. Another forced interpretation—not the less forced because more familiar—is that by which M. Réville concludes that Jesus arrived at the conviction of his own Messiahship only late in his ministry. He thinks that the experiences of his youth, culminating in his baptism, led him towards a Messianic conclusion, but the temptation left him in doubt. It was not until the close of the Galilean ministry that he became sure of his call. Hence, everything which finds place earlier in the sources must be so interpreted as to fit this order of development. Such an utterance as, "The Son of Man has authority on the earth to forgive sins" (Mark 2: 10), must mean "humanity, pure or purified, having arrived at the exalted station to which it is called by God, effaces, and does not know further, the faults which constituted and prolonged its anterior condition of moral infirmity"!

A long section is given to the criticism of the gospels (I, 282–360). M. Réville follows the commonly received two-document theory of the origin of the synoptic gospels, with some minor peculiarities. He holds to a proto-Mark, differing from ours chiefly in the absence from it of matter which seems to him legendary; the Logia are found in more original form in Matthew than in Luke; the so-called Peræan section in Luke is from a third, unknown source; and in each of the three gospels oral tradition has a part and furnishes most of that which Réville is moved to reject as legendary. The fourth gospel is for our author an extremely late document—about A.D. 140—written by a devout mystic who reworked the evangelic tradition in the interests of his doctrine that Jesus is the Logos. The dominance of this concept is seen throughout the gospel. It explains the omission of the baptism of Jesus, the temptation, Gethsemane, the cry from the cross, and the like. From M. Réville's treatment one would never suspect that it could be possible for Harnack to make a strong case for the thesis that the Logos doctrine actually appears in the gospel nowhere

outside of the prologue—an essay, by the way, which finds no mention in Réville's bibliography. Of course, this gospel is valueless in Réville's estimation as a source for the history of Jesus, and he makes practically no use of it. On questions of textual criticism the reader is referred to Gebhardt's revision of Tischendorf's text, and to Tischendorf's *Critica Major*, edition of 1859! One would pass this as a type error, did it not appear that, in at least one passage (Matt. 17:21), our author follows the seventh edition of Tischendorf where it differs from the eighth.

These volumes, the fruit of labors which have evidently been arduous, must be acknowledged to be disappointing. The criticism is too often trivial, the treatment of the sources too often arbitrary, the use of accepted data too often partial. The book has not the spiritual insight of Keim, nor the poetic charm of Renan. Undoubtedly earnest in purpose, it leaves the impression of a great tragedy, and not in the sense which M. Réville intends. If this representation is true, Jesus made wreck of his own life by proving false to his own high vision. The temple cleansing was his fall.

The book contains an excellent map and an index of subjects. An index of Scripture passages is lacking, and is missed.

NEWTON CENTER, MASS.

RUSH RHEES.

DE QUATUOR QUÆ IN NOVO TESTAMENTO DE CÆNA DOMINI EXTANT
RELATIONUM NATURA AC INDOLE. CAROLUS GULIELMUS
RUDOLPHUS SCHAEFER. Königsberg: 1896. Pp. 40, 8vo.

THE facts which this pamphlet attempts to meet, and which have been used by Jülicher, Spitta, and others, to discredit the ritual character and permanence of the Last Supper are these: (1) In Mark the words of Jesus, "This do in remembrance of me," which are the warrant for the perpetuation of the rite, are wanting. (2) Luke 22:19b, 20 is omitted by Westcott and Hort, on the authority of codex D principally. This means that, as you get back towards the probable primitive account, authority for the rite tends to disappear, and finally you are left with a totally denuded account.

Against this the writer urges (1) the fact of the perpetuation of the rite from the very beginning, showing in what way the apostles, who are the authorities for whatever accounts we have, understood our Lord. (2) That all the accounts, including 1 Cor. 11:23-25, which is the most detailed, are derived from the Twelve, and that the difference of more